

Dear Colleague

LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOLS FORUM

I would like to invite you to a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools' Forum to be held on **Wednesday 23 March 2022, 2.00 pm via Teams.**

Please see below the agenda for the meeting.

Yours sincerely

Karen Brown
Clerk to the Schools Forum

AGENDA

Paper

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Apologies and Substitutions | |
| 2. | Minutes and Matters Arising | 1 |
| 3. | De-delegation for School Improvement Proposal | 2 |
| 4. | Any Other Business | |
| 5. | Date of Next Meeting | |

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a meeting of the Leicestershire Schools Forum
via Teams on Wednesday 23 February 2022 at 2.00 pm**

Present

Liam Powell	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Kath Kelly	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Julie McBrearty	Secondary Academy Headteacher
Jane Lennie	Secondary Maintained Governor
Jane McKay	Primary Academy Headteacher
Ed Petrie	Primary Academy Headteacher
Karen Allen	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Jane Dawda	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Alison Ruff	Primary Maintained Headteacher
Kelly Dryden	Special Academy Representative
Graham Bett	DNCC Representative

In attendance

Jane Moore, Director of Children and Family Services
David Atterbury, Head of Service, Education Sufficiency
Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Corporate Resources
Ted Walker, Senior Education Effectiveness Partner

		Action
1.	Apologies and Substitutions Apologies were received from Martin Towers, Claire Allen, Zoe Wortley and Jason Brooks.	
2.	Minutes and Matters Arising The minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2021 were agreed.	
3.	2022/23 Schools Budget Jenny Lawrence introduced the report which presents the 2022/23 Dedicated Schools Grant Settlement for Leicestershire and the 2022/23 Schools Budget. Jenny explained that the annual report sets out how all things related to school funding and brings to Schools Forum their particular powers and decisions that it has which are set out in paragraph 15. Jenny added that in paragraph 18 there are some indications that the DfE are developing a revised approach to DSG deficits and it would appear that the DfE are in the process of negotiating new Safety Valve Agreements for 2022/23; the DfE have not spoken to Leicestershire therefore there would not be a Safety Value Agreement for Leicestershire but they are also stating they are increasing their support and challenge to local authorities which was unclear but Schools Forum would be kept	

informed.

Jenny reported that the Dedicated Schools Grant final settlement arrived in December. Jenny highlighted that the supplementary grant for maintained schools which was to help schools meet the cost of the health and social care levy but also for significant cost pressures expected over the coming periods. Jenny said that these costs, however, have not been confirmed or clarified and the supplementary grant was expected to be added to the National Funding Formula (NFF) from 2023/24.

Jenny referred to paragraph 24 which sets out that school funding remains a 'soft' school funding formula for 2022/23 and Leicestershire had set the schools budgets as the NFF. Jenny added that from discussions with colleagues regionally it would appear that Leicestershire was one of the few authorities regionally that had been able to deliver the NFF in full without having to adjust budgets because of increases in areas like FSM and deprivation creating cost pressures as a result of the lag in LA funding.

Jenny added that the retain school growth funding is set out in the paper and to note the Secretary of State did not approve the schools block transfer so again schools' budgets would not be reduced by the transfer. Jenny added that the DfE has yet to confirm that the Leicestershire formula is compliant but have no outstanding queries with them so there may be a timeline issue within their process.

Jenny referred to paragraphs 36-38 on de-delegation for which Jane Moore would take this part of the report. Jane stated that this was a significant development since Schools Forum last met. Jane said that last autumn the DfE went out to consultation on the removal of the School Improvement, Monitoring and Brokerage Grant which had been allocated to the local authority for many years to support its statutory duties around school improvement and deliver those expectations set out on the Schools Causing Concern guidance. Jane stated that the consultation received a large number of responses nationally and Leicestershire County Council, East Midlands and the National Association of Directors of Children's Services all made a response opposing every part of the consultation. Jane said that in January 2022 the consultation outcome was published and the DfE would be going ahead with all the proposal to remove the grant. Jane added that the grant was ring-fenced and funds school improvement activities with maintained schools.

Jane said that the grant would be reduced by 50% in 2022/23 and removed totally from 2023/24. The DfE, as part of the consultation, would allow local authorities to de-delegate funding from maintained schools to the local authority in order to continue to fund school improvement in maintained schools. Jane said that the DfE's rationale for this was that it provided consistency with how Multi Academy Trusts fund school improvement through the top-slice applied to schools' budgets. Jane stated that the proposal was to meet with Schools Forum, as indicated in paragraph 39, to seek permission to de-delegate before 31 March. Jane added that if Schools Forum do not agree the DfE has reserved the ability for the local authority to seek approval from the

Secretary of State. Jane commented that she wished to share with Forum the direction of travel and like other authorities across the country Leicestershire are going to seek de-delegation.

Jenny referred to paragraph 41 which sets out that in line with the additional funding that would come through to all schools in terms of the supplementary grant, additional funding had been allocated to the High Needs Block. Jenny added that in line with the NFF per pupil increases the banding rates payable to special schools are to be increased by 2.6% which was the first increase to those rates since 2013.

Jenny referred to paragraph 46 which sets out the updated position on High Needs DSG and confirmation that there would be future increases in the grant from the DfE which had improved the position a little but remains a concern with the number of EHCPs coming through.

Leicestershire are working with consultants on the possible issues and opportunities within the system to reduce costs and this would be reported back to Schools Forum in the future.

Jenny referred to paragraph 68 that pupil premium rates have increased and as with the supplementary grant there are no allocations published only the rates per pupil. Jenny said that schools in their planning process would need to look at the background data to be able to do this and Finance are in the process of setting up finance briefings for schools on the 2022/23 budget proposals and other thing to be looking at in terms of schools' budget setting.

Jenny referred to paragraph 71 and outlined the financial position of the County Council in terms of next year and beyond and work going on in the background on how the budget gap would be settled. Jenny added that through Council networks and other colleagues the situation in Leicestershire is similar to other local authorities and future years are looking difficult.

Jenny asked if there were any questions.

Jane Dawda referred to the de-delegation element and assumed it was a case of one receiving the money and then the local authority take it back again and the school would not see a difference. Jenny explained that de-delegation would mean a per pupil contribution from the school budget and effectively paying for the school improvement function. Jane added that the DfE are removing the money and if de-delegation went ahead, it would come direct from the school's budget and therefore schools would see a reduction in budget. The DfE's point that if a school was in a MAT, they think it would put schools on an equitable status.

Jane Lennie commented that there was a growth in population and therefore not enough money particularly from developers to ensure that schools have enough provision. Jane commented that there was an issue with the funding stream from the DfE.

Jenny responded that firstly in terms of S106 contributions from the developments of new houses that was generated by a yield rate that expects a certain number of pupils per type of housing, but that funding can only be used for capital spending on the provision of additional school places. Jenny continued that if the money was not used for additional places, or the development does not go ahead, then the

money would not come into the local authority, so Section 106 is only for building new places as a result of housing developments above a certain size. Jenny added that in terms of capital funding for the local authority again, as a local authority, funding was received for the need for additional school places so if schools needed to expand because there was a shortfall of places and in assessing the shortfall of places the DfE look at school capacity and expected pupil numbers but that grant is only to develop new school places so as a local authority little funding was received in terms of maintenance but no funding for significant developments. Jenny said that revenue funding coming into school was down to the NFF and the funding for the following financial year reflects the characteristics that are recorded on the school census in October so there was lagging funding but that comes into the local authority, out to the school and reflected those changes in pupil population and pupil growth seen in individual schools. Jenny stated that there was a whole range of issues the local authority had to manage with the constraints about the national system and there are things where there was no ability to change.

Jane Lennie asked if there would be any mileage in addressing the issues of shortfall of places with her local Councillor or MP. Jane Moore stated that there was clearly not enough money in the system and was a matter for Jane if she wished to raise it with politicians. Jane said, however, these letters tend to come to her but would be helpful to raise these issues in order for them to understand the complexity of the system.

Alison Ruff asked about the figure being taken from school budgets in order to cover the school improvement activities and what would schools be provided with in return. Jane Moore explained that this was still being worked on in terms of the local authority delivering those statutory functions around school improvement to maintained schools. Jenny added that the figure was being worked on and would be available in the next few days but working on the basis of filling the gap by the removal of the funding it was looking at £9 per pupil. Jenny clarified de-delegation only affects maintained schools and not academies in any way.

Karen Allen commented that as previously this was just about maintained schools but the relationship was for all schools and asked if there was any of that budget that would be de-delegated for maintained schools being used to cover activities that are applicable for all schools e.g moderation and checking of the assessments.

Jane Moore said de-delegation would only be used to fund school improvement in maintained schools. Jane added that as a local authority additional funding is put into the Education Effectiveness Team to fund some of that wider support across Leicestershire and part of the work around the de-delegation consideration was putting together the local authority's future offer, how it would continue to look like of which some would be funded through the de-delegation.

Karen Allen asked if de-delegation comes through the formula and therefore back in the same situation if schools are on the floor of the NFF as some schools pay a greater share than others. Jenny commented that de-delegation works in a different way; the process for it was that a schools formula budget was allocated which was not moderated in any shape or form and effectively de-delegation was a charge on that budget rather than any change to the formula.

Liam Powell asked in light of the Secretary of State's decision not to

approve the Schools Block Transfer and its impact on the high needs deficit what are the plans in terms of the management of that going forward.

Jane said that the DfE had now written to Leicestershire because the deficit was of concern to them, and a meeting had been arranged for next month to ask what the local authority's plans are to reduce to deficit.

Jane added that Leicestershire was now in the DfE process and part of that offering support in terms reducing the deficit. Jane commented that the position in the High Needs Block was getting worse so are currently reviewing the high needs programme as it was not making the progress it needed to make. Jane said that there would not be any specific moves as a result of not getting the transfer as considering the deficit as a whole. Jane said that the local authority would not be looking at anything for the £2m as part of the £63m issue that needs to be worked on and would be working with schools as previously.

Graham Bett referred to paragraph 17 and asked if it was a reference to the same thing which is about the deficit and Leicestershire's version of that management plan is the high needs development plan. Jane confirmed it was, but the DfE would want to speak to her about the robustness of that plan and whether they consider the plan to be effective. Jane added that the other part of it sets out that if the DfE intervened their expectation would be that there was a management plan to deal with the deficit within local authorities which Leicestershire already had in place.

Graham stated that the paper refers to the management plan being regularly updated and presented to Forum which they have been but questioned whether a further update was due. Jane commented that an update was given as part of the process for the consultation on the Schools Block Transfer and updates had been given on the position a number of times but agreed Schools Forum are probably due another update. Jenny stated that from some of the conversations held with the DfE there was still that question mark under a NFF what the role of Schools Forum would be and there are often comments made from the DfE that they expect Schools Forum to be more actively involved in contributing to that management plan but there has not been anything specific around that.

Graham referred to the pupil premium rates increase and asked how long it had been since it was increased. Jenny said she would have to check and confirm but thought it was about 3 years ago. Discussion took place on the low percentage increase over the last 3 years and Jenny stated that in most of the funding consultations since the pupil premium was introduced the local authority have argued why that should be a separate funding stream because if added into the formula the rates would increase as the funding within the formula increased.

Schools Forum approved the retention of the budget to fund future school growth (paragraph 15, item 2). 8 agreed, 0 disagreed and 1 abstention.

Schools Forum approved the retention of budgets to meet the prescribed statutory duties of the local authority and to meet historic costs (Paragraph 15, item 3). 10 agreed, 0 disagreed and no abstentions.

	<p>Schools Forum approved the centrally retained early years funding (Paragraph 15, item 5). 10 agreed, 0 disagreed and no abstentions.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the number and average cost of commissioned places for children and young people with High Needs (Paragraph 45).</p> <p>Schools Forum approved the action to be taken in respect of schools where the Special Educational Needs (SEN) notional budget is insufficient to meet the aggregated value of High Needs Funding Element 2 (Paragraphs 61-64). 10 agreed, 0 disagreed and no abstentions.</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the average per pupil funding to be taken into account for recoupment for excluded pupils and other purposes (Paragraph 65)</p> <p>Schools Forum noted the payment rates for the Early Years Funding formula (Paragraph 70)</p>	
4.	<p>Maintained School Deficits and Academy Conversion</p> <p>Liam Powell explained that he had been approached by a Multi Academy Trust in the north-west of the county who wish to welcome in a school from the north of the county. Liam said that the MAT board wished to proceed but the school would introduce a deficit to the Trust. Liam added that the ESFA need to be satisfied that the Trust was not exposing itself to financial risk and the school could manage its budget.</p> <p>Liam said that the Trust was prepared to ask the local authority to support financially, and it was important to demonstrate to the ESFA that all options had been explored by the MAT regardless of the answer. Liam said that the historic deficit was not helped by age range change for the school that wants to join the Trust and this was being managed and the issue of the two buildings involved on the campus which had now been sorted. Liam said that the school had presented different models for progressing this finance and if the lump sum for both schools separately before they joined could have been continued then there would have been no deficit but one of them was closed down. Liam said that alternatively the school could have grown and this could have been another way to manage the deficit and there had been delays in completing the organisation of the campus which had been picked up by the school as well. Liam stated that the local authority had provided everything it could financially so there was no question about that but feel that there had been a historical injustice and the deficit needs to be resolved.</p> <p>Liam explained that the if the deficit cannot be resolved the next step could be to approach the Secretary of State for either the money to be given to clear the deficit or approval given for it to be paid afterwards under a managed plan. Liam stated that the Trust and school asked for him as the representative for LSH to raise with Schools Forum. Liam and Jenny had spoken and went through the history of the case and there are</p>	

	<p>other things that the school could have done historically as well to address this but the deficit goes with the school and there was no other money in the local authority to support with the deficit and was asked to raise this which he had.</p> <p>As Chair of this meeting, Karen Allen said that Schools Forum do not have role in this decision and the local authority's policy had been clear for some time that any deficits are only taken on by the local authority when the school is sponsored and not in any other situations. Karen added that Schools Forum do not have a role for looking at solutions to a deficit and there was not a fund, to consider this would be inequitable to other schools in this situation who have had to carry deficits with them on conversion previously and the comment that the MAT needs to protect itself would open the door to putting the local authority into a very difficult position because they too do not have funds to resolve and if they did this for one school they would have do the same for other schools that were in that position in the future.</p> <p>Karen thanked Liam for bringing it to Schools Forum but reiterated there was no role for the Schools Forum in this discussion and hopefully services the purpose of what Liam had been asked to do and noted that a discussion had taken place.</p> <p>Jane Lennie commented that in 2016 this was presented to the Secretary of State, but the Government changed and had not been referred to again.</p>	
5.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>De-delegation/Next Meeting Jenny raised that there would be an additional Schools Forum meeting in March for the de-delegation item to fulfil the requirements of that process and the meeting would be on Wednesday 23 March at 2.00 pm. This meeting is only a vote for maintained schools but requires a Leicestershire Schools Forum meeting. Jenny added that if non-maintained school members chose not to attend that meeting this would not be an issue and unfortunately timescales did not allow for the item to be on the agenda today.</p> <p>Graham Bett asked why the January meeting was cancelled. Jenny responded that the January meeting was an additional meeting put in diaries in case Schools Forum needed to take decisions on the consultation on the Schools Block Transfer and was not needed.</p> <p>Future meetings: Monday 6 June 2022, 2.00 pm Thursday 29 September 2022, 2.00 pm</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



SCHOOLS FORUM

23 MARCH 2022

DE-DELEGATION FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROPOSAL

Content Applicable to;		School Phase;	
Maintained Primary and Secondary Schools	X	Pre School	
Academies		Foundation Stage	
PVI Settings		Primary	
Special Schools / Academies		Secondary	
Local Authority		Post 16	
		High Needs	

Content Requires;		By;	
Noting	X	Maintained Primary School Members	X
Decision	X	Maintained Secondary School Members	X
		Maintained Special School Members	
		Academy Members	
		All Schools Forum	

Purpose of Report

1. This report presents the consultation response on the proposal for de-delegation of funding for school improvement functions for Local Authority maintained schools.

Recommendations

2. That Schools Forum is asked to note the changes to the way that Local Authority school improvement functions are funded.
3. The Schools Forum representatives for maintained schools are recommended to approve the de-delegation of £9 per pupil for Local Authority school improvement functions from maintained schools' budgets.

Background (details in Appendix 1)

4. The DfE is implementing a policy to reduce the Local Authority level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and to remove it entirely from 2023/24. Instead, it is using the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 to allow local authorities to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives or by agreement of the Secretary of State.
5. If no de-delegation funding is agreed the capacity of the Local Authority to maintain its schools in a systematic and strategic way would be significantly at risk.
6. No alternative funding stream has been identified to support this work; therefore the implications of not continuing would potentially leave schools isolated and dependent on the capacity of local leadership and governance. Whilst some higher performing schools may benefit financially in the short term, this approach would conflict with both national policy (for schools to be within strong groups) and local experience (that a proactive approach to school improvement ultimately achieves better outcomes for children alongside better long-term value for money).

Consultation

7. A consultation was undertaken with maintained schools over a two-week period. Details of the consultation are shown in Appendix 1.
8. The results show that of 20 schools who responded, 18 “fully understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal”; 16 agreed (question 2) that the core offer represents value for money, 1 did not respond to this question, 2 no opinion and 1 disagreed. For question 7, “I support the proposal”, 14 respondents agreed, 2 expressed no opinion, and 4 disagreed.
9. If respondents are representative this suggests strong, but not unanimous support for the proposal. Comments received (from a limited number of schools) suggest a strength of feeling on both sides.
10. The consultation results are shown in Appendix 2.

Resource Implications

11. No additional resource implications identified.

Equal Opportunity Issues

12. None identified.

Background Papers

[DFE consultation](#)

Officers to Contact

Ted Walker, Senior Education Effectiveness Partner

Email: ted.walker@leics.gov.uk

Tel: 0116 305 3365

Jenny Lawrence, Finance Business Partner, Schools and High Needs

Email: jenny.lawrence@leics.gov.uk

Tel: 0116 305 6401

APPENDIX 1

Consultation on the De-delegation* of funding to deliver Local Authority School Improvement Functions

**De-delegation effectively means the retention of part of a school budget by the LA before the total is calculated*

Introduction

1. On 11 January 2022 the DfE published the outcome of their consultation on reforming how local authorities' school improvement functions are funded. Since 2017, the Local Authority School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering grant has been allocated to local authorities to support them in fulfilling their statutory school improvement functions under Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and their additional school improvement expectations as set out in the Schools Causing Concern (SCC) guidance (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate
2. As a result of the consultation the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant will reduce by 50% from financial year 2022/23 and be removed entirely from 2023/24. Instead, the Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 will allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares with the approval of the Schools Forum maintained school representatives.
3. In recent years Leicestershire has received the following amounts:
 - 2019/20 £330,371
 - 2020/21 £339,189
 - 2021/22 £314,887
 - 2022/23 £157,444 (projected future income as a result of the funding reduction)
 - 2023/24 and onwards £0
4. It is proposed that £9 per pupils is de-delegated from maintained school budgets in 2022/23 to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions. Approval for this will be sought from the Schools Forum.
5. Based on current pupil numbers this would equate to £166,500 to compensate the 50% reduction in grant. This amount would reduce as maintained school pupil numbers reduce through academy conversion.

Background

6. The DfE launched a consultation seeking views on a proposal to remove the LA level School Improvement Monitoring & Brokering Grant (SIMBG) and instead allow local authorities, with the approval of their maintained Schools Forum representatives, to replace the funding for this function by de-delegating funding from maintained schools' budget shares.
7. The outcome of the consultation was published on 11 January 2022 when it was confirmed that the SIMBG would reduce by 50% in financial year 2022/23 and be

removed entirely from 2023/24. The Schools and Early Years Finance Regulations 2022 will be amended to allow LAs to de-delegate funding from maintained school budget shares so that they can continue to carry out their core school improvement functions.

8. The timing of the announcement has made planning for the next financial year challenging. This proposal is an interim measure to effectively maintain the status quo, ease the transition and prepare a longer-term offer for maintained schools in Leicestershire from 2023/24 onwards.
9. If that status quo were to be extended into following years there would need to be an ongoing de-delegation of £18 per pupil to cover the same level of per pupil funding. This amount would reduce as schools move from maintained to academies.
10. This proposal only relates to 2022/23 in order to allow time for a longer term approach in 2023/24. Funding forum is only being asked for a decision relating to 2022/23 at this time.

Statutory School Improvement Functions for the Local Authority

11. Local Authorities have statutory school improvement functions under [Part 4 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006](#) and additional school improvement expectations as set out in the [Schools Causing Concern \(SCC\) guidance](#) (collectively referred to as core school improvement activities). In summary, these activities require councils to monitor performance of maintained schools, broker school improvement provision, and intervene as appropriate.

The Use of this funding in Leicestershire

12. This funding is used to fulfil Leicestershire Local Authority statutory responsibilities around maintained schools including:
 - An Education Effectiveness Partner linked to each school developing a relationship between the school and LA offering advocacy and oversight: a watchful eye and critical friend giving support and somewhere to go in challenging times; ad hoc responses and signposting; knowledge of the position of schools and if and when intervention is needed.
 - Partnership development to support collaborative groups to become self-supporting, sustainable and robust “strong families of schools”.
 - Commissioned health checks and audits as appropriate; support in preparation for, and response to, inspection.
 - Development support around safeguarding, financial planning and governance, and support with working with a range of linked LA and wider services.
 - Commissioned school improvement support, from former Teaching School Alliances, MATs and other quality assured providers.
13. Maintaining this service and engagement with schools strengthens the ability of the Education Effectiveness Team to add value to all schools and academies through its universal offer, funded alongside the LAMB grant via County Council funding, (Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership strategic improvement activities,

communications, advocacy for schools and signposting) and insight into the education sector in Leicestershire.

14. The core offer for LA maintained schools currently includes the following:-
- a. Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP), providing a single point of contact, help & advice, support & signposting (local authority, localised and Hubs), advocacy and confidential conversations
 - b. Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools
 - c. A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback including;
 - i. Health-check and evaluation (quality of teaching and learning)
 - ii. Safeguarding audit
 - iii. Pupil Premium review
 - iv. SEND review
 - v. External Review of Governance
 - vi. Web site audit
 - d. Next steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support
 - e. Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.
 - f. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes
 - g. The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance
 - h. Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas, recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum and ARS (Audience Response System) Training
 - i. Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support
 - j. Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools
 - k. A range of regular communications
 - l. Full day local authority induction for new headteachers
 - m. Regular meetings, seminars and webinars
15. It is proposed that this core offer continues to be delivered through the de-delegation.
16. The Education Effectiveness Team engages with and supports all schools and education settings in Leicestershire through strategic planning and partnership (including the Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership (which acts as a hub for this activity); managing communications such as the headteacher briefing, social media and meetings with headteachers; and fulfilling statutory duties around safeguarding, moderation and SACRE. The team identifies opportunities to make appropriate connections for the benefit of children in Leicestershire. **This activity is funded separately**, and alongside the LAMB grant funded activities for maintained schools. This proposal sets out the proposed use of the de-delegated funding from maintained schools.

School Improvement Budget 2022/23

17. The regulations allow for LAs to deduct the funding from maintained schools budget shares as an Education Function for services relating to maintained schools only in much the same way as for de-delegated services. If the maintained schools' School Forum representatives agree that this funding can be deducted from school budget shares, £9 per pupil will be de-delegated in 2022/23. The per pupil rate will be the same for both primary and secondary schools, in accordance with the guidance issued.
18. It is not possible to transfer any year end surplus to a future year. Should any of this funding not be spent in the financial year it is anticipated that it would be returned proportionately to the collaborative maintained school groups to facilitate local school improvement.
19. It should be noted that if the Schools Forum maintained schools representatives do not approve to de-delegate funds for this function that the Secretary of State retains the power to approve the de-delegation contrary to the decision of the Schools Forum if it is deemed necessary to ensure that the local authority is adequately funded to exercise its core school improvement functions.

Consultation on De-delegation of Funding for School Improvement in Maintained Schools

School Name:

URN/ DfE No:

Completed By: (Headteacher)

1 - The DfE has now outlined that funding for school improvement and monitoring should no longer be allocated to the local authorities in the form of a grant. This should/ could instead be funded through the de-delegation of funds from the maintained school budget share with the approval of their Schools Forum maintained schools representatives

Do you understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal?

Fully understand – Partially understand – Not fully understanding

2 - The LCC Core Offer for maintained schools includes:

- a. Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP), providing a single point of contact, help & advice, support & signposting (local authority, localised and Hubs), advocacy and confidential conversations
- b. Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools
- c. A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback including;
 - i. Health-check and evaluation (quality of teaching and learning)
 - ii. Safeguarding audit
 - iii. Pupil Premium review
 - iv. SEND review
 - v. External Review of Governance
 - vi. Web site audit
- d. Next Steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support
- e. Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.
- f. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes
- g. The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance
- h. Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas, recent examples include: KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum and ARS (Audience Response System) Training
- i. Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support
- j. Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools
- k. A range of regular communications
- l. Full day local authority induction for new headteachers
- m. Regular meetings, seminars and webinars

Do you agree that this represents a comprehensive core offer which represents value for money?

Agree – No opinion – Disagree

3 - Which areas of the LA Core Offer are you most likely to access?

- a. Partnership working with a dedicated Education Effectiveness Partner (EEP), providing a single point of contact, help & advice, support & signposting (local authority, localised and Hubs), advocacy and confidential conversations

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely – Unlikely

- b. Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely – Unlikely

- c. A rolling programme of independent checks and audits to provide external validation, confirmation and feedback;
- i. Health-check and evaluation (quality of teaching and learning)
 - ii. Safeguarding audit
 - iii. Pupil Premium review
 - iv. SEND review
 - v. External Review of Governance
 - vi. Web site audit

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- d. Next Steps support with the above points, in partnership with school leaders. The EEP will discuss how best to support whether this is through commissioned input, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) or other additional support

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- e. Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- f. The EEP will track any commissioned support to ensure the timeliness and quality, ensuring it meets the desired outcomes

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- g. The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- h. Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas, e.g. KS2 Reading Comprehension, Talk for Writing, Preparing for Ofsted and SEF/ SDP Best Practice as well as accessing other external funded CPD opportunities, e.g. Curriculum and ARS (Audience Response System) Training

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- i. Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- j. Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- k. A bi-weekly bulletin

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

- l. Full day local authority induction for new headteachers

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely
m. Regular meetings, seminars and webinars

Highly Likely – Neither Likely nor Unlikely - Unlikely

5 - LCC proposes that a phased approach should be supported in year one by de-delegating £9 per pupil to maintain the LA core offer to all maintained schools. Do you agree that this represents short term value for money?

Agree – No opinion - Disagree

6 - LCC proposes that a more detailed and sustainable longer-term proposal is put in place year two and onwards. This could most efficiently combine all aspects of LA services. Would this be a helpful approach?

Agree – No opinion - Disagree

7 - I support this proposal of a £9 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2022/23

yes – No opinion - no

I understand that the final decision around the de-delegation of funding to support these functions is retained by the Secretary of State for Education.

PLEASE RETURN THIS CONSULTATION TO educationeffectiveness@leics.gov.uk BY 9 am ON FRIDAY 18th MARCH together with any comments on or questions about the proposal.

APPENDIX 2 Consultation Results

	Fully understand	Partially understand	Not fully understanding
1. Do you understand the impact on the Local Authority core offer for maintained schools resulting from this proposal?	18	1	0 (1 no response)
	Agree	No opinion	Disagree
2. The LCC Core Offer for maintained schools represents a comprehensive core offer which represents value for money	16	2	1 (1 no response)
Which areas of the LA Core Offer are you most likely to access?	Highly Likely	Neither Likely nor Unlikely	Unlikely
a) Partnership working with EEP	15	3	1 (1 no response)
b) Support for the development of local collaborative families of schools	12	2	5 (1 no response)
c) A rolling programme of independent checks and audits	17	0	2 (1 no response)
d) Next Steps support with the above points	11	4 (3 no response)	2
e) Support in advance of, during and after OFSTED inspection.	14	3	2 (1 no response)
f) The EEP will track any commissioned support	15	1 (2 no response)	2
g) The EEP can commission specialised audits for HR and Finance	9	7	3 (1 no response)
h) Fully funded CPD opportunities in targeted areas	14	2 (3 no response)	1
i) Commissioned School Improvement Plan (SIP) support, mentoring and or targeted peer support	7	5 (3 no response)	5
j) Financial support with evidenced-based research projects in schools	10	3 (3 no response)	4
k) A bi-weekly bulletin	11	6	2 1 (no response)

l) Full day local authority induction for new headteachers	5	4	9 2 (no response)
m) Regular meetings, seminars and webinars	11	6 (3 no response)	0
	Agree	No opinion	Disagree
5. LCC proposes that a phased approach should be supported in year one by de-delegating £9 per pupil to maintain the LA core offer to all maintained schools. Do you agree that this represents short term value for money?	12	4 (1 no response)	3
6. LCC proposes that a more detailed and sustainable longer-term proposal is put in place year two and onwards. This could most efficiently combine all aspects of LA services. Would this be a helpful approach?	15	3 (1 no response)	1
	Yes	No opinion	No
I support this proposal of a £9 per pupil de-delegation to deliver the local authority's core school improvement functions for maintained schools for 2022/23	14	2	4